

Remarks

In the present response, four claims (1, 3, 9, 11) are amended. Claims 1 – 14 are presented for examination.

In light of the current amendments and remarks, Applicants make a sincere effort to place this application in condition for allowance.

I. Claims Rejection: 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite “a magnetic tape” so this rejection is now cured.

II. Claims Rejection: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,364,232 (Nemeth). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Nemeth neither teaches nor suggests each element in the claims, these claims are allowable over Nemeth.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Nemeth. By way of example, claim 1 recites “a securing mechanism having a **resilient member** moveable for releasably securing a position of the guide member with respect to the hub” (bold added). This recitation is similar to the recitation appearing in dependent claim 11, which the Examiner indicated as being allowed. Nowhere does Nemeth teach or even suggest that a resilient member is movable for releasably securing the guide member to the hub.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Nemeth.

Claim 3

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that dependent claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 3 is placed in independent form. Applicants note that intervening claim 2 is not included in independent claim 3. Applicants believe that dependent claim 2 is not necessary for patentability of independent claim 3. Specifically, independent claim 3 recites a securing mechanism that has “a **resilient member** configured to bias an engagement portion coupled to the resilient member into a corresponding receiving portion located on the guide member” (bold added). Nowhere does Nemeth teach or even suggest such a resilient member.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 3 is allowable over Nemeth.

Claim 9

Claim 9 recites numerous limitations that are not taught or suggested in Nemeth. By way of example, claim 9 recites “that the magnetic tape is windable onto the hub and the guide member in a **first direction of rotation and a second direction of rotation** while the guide member is secured to the hub.” (bold added). Nowhere does Nemeth teach or even suggest this recitation.

Nemeth never states that the tape is windable onto the hub in both a first direction of rotation and a second direction of rotation while the guide member is secured to the hub. By contrast, Nemeth expressly teaches that the tape is windable onto the hub in only one direction. In Fig. 1 of Nemeth, arrow # 46 indicates the rotational direction of reel hub 47: “In order to wind the magnetic tape 20 onto the take-up reel 45 the take-up reel 45 should be driven in the direction indicated by an arrow 46” (col. 5, lines 35-37). Nemeth repeatedly reiterates this teaching (see also col. 7, lines 35-38; and col. 8, lines 55-60). Once the pull-out assembly 56 is secured to the take-up reel 47, the reel is then moved again in direction of arrow # 46 to wind tape. In other words, Nemeth expressly teaches that the tape is windable onto the hub in only one direction.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 9 and its dependent claims are allowable over Nemeth.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529